

To: DeLuca, Isabel[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov]
From: Birnbaum, Rona
Sent: Mon 3/6/2017 9:26:17 PM
Subject: RE: for OAP IO review: press Q & response on Endangerment finding

Agree, the sentence is not necessary. Thanks for circling back with me.

From: DeLuca, Isabel
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 4:24 PM
To: Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: for OAP IO review: press Q & response on Endangerment finding

Hi Rona,

After chatting with Jackie, I struck a sentence (in email below, scroll down to see). Jackie was concerned that the sentence **Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process** but I think the paragraph can stand without it. What do you think? Give me a ring if you want to discuss (I can explain her concerns more if you're curious.)

Thanks,
Isabel

From: Krieger, Jackie
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 4:08 PM
To: DeLuca, Isabel <DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov>; VonDemHagen, Rebecca <VonDemHagen.Rebecca@epa.gov>; Clarke, Deirdre <clarke.deirdre@epa.gov>
Cc: Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: for OAP IO review: press Q & response on Endangerment finding

Thanks, Isabel. I have a couple of quick questions – I'll give you a call, easier to discuss than write it out ☺

From: DeLuca, Isabel
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 4:00 PM
To: Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>; VonDemHagen, Rebecca <VonDemHagen.Rebecca@epa.gov>; Clarke, Deirdre <clarke.deirdre@epa.gov>

Cc: Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>;
Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>
Subject: for OAP IO review: press Q & response on Endangerment finding

Hi Jackie,

Flagging for you a press question that came in last week on the endangerment finding.
The response is due to the press office tomorrow. (Scroll down for the questions and response.)

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns, otherwise I'll forward up the chain to Andrea.

Thank you!

Isabel

Question:

Zack Colman with CSMonitor here. Looking to get more info on the endangerment finding.

Had talked to Sen. Inhofe and he mentioned "opening up" the endangerment finding to add more science.

1. Is there a sense that you could add science to the literature without going through the regulatory review process?
2. What would the practical effect of adding science be — would doing so call for potentially less or more aggressive regulation, depending on what the science says?
3. Would it *necessitate* more or less aggressive regulation depending on that science?

Separately, have a couple more questions on some broad-stroke concepts.

4. What would need to happen to scrap the endangerment finding entirely?
5. Would withdrawing from the IPCC have any effect on the endangerment finding?
6. Does the endangerment finding necessitate regulation through the Clean Air Act? Or could regulation be done through another statute?
- 6a. Or, rather, is there any specific directive to regulate within the Clean Air Act? And is the endangerment finding agnostic on statute?

Response:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process